DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 771 JC 750 124

AUTHOR Vernon, Christie
TITLE An Analysis of Faculty and Student Attitudes Toward the Thomas Nelson Community College Library.
PUB DATE Jul 73
NOTE 71p.; Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Facility Utilization Research; Information Needs; *Junior College Libraries; *Junior Colleges; Library Instruction; *Research Needs; *Student Attitudes; Student Needs; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Thomas Nelson Community College

ABSTRACT

In 1972-73, the staff of the Thomas Nelson Community College Library conducted a self-study as a part of the process of sustaining accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Questionnaires were administered to 61 (77%) of the full-time faculty members and to 195 (13%) of the 1,504 FTE day and evening students to determine their library-utilization habits and their attitudes toward the library. The most important finding was that students who received orientation in the use of the library tended to use the library more often and to hold better attitudes toward the library than those who had not received orientation; this led to the recommendation that instruction in the use of the library become a part of every possible course. Faculty members who use the library frequently are more often aware of its shortcomings than those who do not use it frequently. Students who use the library most often tend to be full-time freshmen. In general, faculty and students alike indicated positive attitudes toward library service, facilities, and holdings. Faculty members requested more depth and variety in the collection; they must recognize their responsibility to recommend appropriate materials for purchase. (DC)

ED101771

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN ANALYSIS OF FACULTY AND STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE THOMAS NELSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE LIBRARY

APPLIED EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

by

Christie Vernon, M.S.L.S.

JC 750 124

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY
JULY, 1973

This study may be quoted freely as long as the author is credited.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christie Vernon

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Copyrighted by

Christie Vernon

1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to David Field and to her peer readers, Charles Bush, Joyce Rollins, and Bobbie Wright, who spent many hours of valuable time reading and criticizing this study. For their kind and intelligent advice, she is deeply grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Statement of Problem 1

Scope and Limitations 1

Significance of Study 2

Review of Related Literature. 3

Statement of Hypotheses 11

Basic Assumptions 14

Definition of Terms 15

Procedures for Collection and Treatment of Data . 16

Presentation of Data: Tables 1 - 27 19

Analysis of Data 37

Summary and Conclusions 49

BIBLIOGRAPHY 58

APPENDIX: Faculty Questionnaire 62
Student Questionnaire 64
List of Classes surveyed. 66

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In order to meet the needs of library users and potential users in the Thomas Nelson Community College community, both for service and for holdings, it is necessary to know the attitudes of the different classes of patrons which this library serves or desires to serve.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This study was concerned with the use patterns and opinions about the library which could be elicited from the population which would be expected to have a need for this library. Questionnaires were administered to all full time faculty and to a random sample of the student body which was believed to be representative of the student population as a whole.

The fact that this study was limited to these groups of participants does not affect the study in any significant way, since the use of the library by the part time faculty, the staff, and the public is minimal. The part time faculty are usually on the campus for one evening class and many of them are teaching non-credit community service courses. It would be very desirable to extend as much service as possible to these teachers and their students; in fact, such non-credit courses as Genealogy are well supported by the library. But, this is not seen as the main mission of the library at this time.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Thomas Nelson Community College is currently conducting a Self-Study in an effort to sustain accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The significance of the relationship of the library to this Self-Study is highlighted by Guy R. Lyle, a noted writer in the library field, in his 1961 book, The Administration of the College Library.

> "...As a result of the librarian's initiative there has been considerable stirring in college circles about the role of the library in the college and more than a few deans and presidents have become concerned about the needs of the library and the means of improving its usefulness. Within the past decade certain of the regional accrediting associations have adopted a new program of evaluation in which the individual college makes a self-survey before the association sends out a visiting team to inspect the college. The library has figured prominently in this self-survey as well as in the investigation and report on the college and its self-survey by the accrediting association's visiting committee. Librarians have been invited to participate with increasing frequency as members of the visiting committee. All of this has produced results which defy exact measurement but which have set dozens of college administrators and professors to thinking hard about the educational effectiveness of the college library." (p.158)

As a part of the self-survey, the T.N.C.C. Coordinator of Library Services developed questionnaires to be given to the faculty and a sample of the student body. (See Appendix for sample questionnaires.) This questionnaire was inspired in part by a study conducted by Kenneth Allen which resulted in his dissertation: Investigation of Student and Faculty Attitudes and Their Utilization of the Community College Library in Three Selected Colleges Within Illinois. (Allen, 1970)

This was a unique and most thorough survey of patrons' attitudes. It

is cited in E.R.I.C. and has been summarized, discussed, and reviewed in many periodicals in the library field. Allen's questionnaires were administered at 3 Illinois junior colleges, to 25 randomly selected classes and to most of the full time faculty. In addition, a special utilization questionnaire was given to all students and faculty who entered the library on a selected week. After testing 49 hypotheses, Dr. Allen made several recommendations for service in the community college library, as well as some suggestions for further research. It was hoped that a similar questionnaire would help the library director at T.N.C.C. to improve library service to all the people the school hopes to serve: its community of faculty, students, and staff.

The T.N.C.C. questionnaire was given to all the full time faculty members and to 195 students who were members of classes chosen at random from the list of all credit course offerings, both day and evening.

The questionnaire was tabulated, and its results summarized in the report of the Library Self-Study Committee. These results will be further discussed and analyzed in this research study, and the significance of the responses tested.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An extensive survey of the literature was done, which included a search of Dissertation Abstracts International, Research in Education (E.R.I.C.), Library Literature, The Education Index, Books in Print, and several special bibliographies and periodicals which are not indexed. This survey revealed the dearth of materials concerned with the patron's

own expression of his needs.

The E.R.I.C. documents were searched from January, 1964 through March of 1973. Aside from the citation of Dr. Allen's study in 1971, the only other relevant study was conducted by Luecke and Sproesser in 1967: Comments and Opinions of Students at Abington High School North Campus Concerning the Library, a Report on the Results of a Student Opinionnaire. This study surveyed a randomly selected sample of 163 ninth and tenth grade students and found that their most frequently expressed desire was for more orientation in the use of the library and more individual help.

Library Literature, the indexing tool for articles in the general fields of library and information science, was searched from 1959-1972, and, although there were hundreds of entries under "Survey" and "Questionnaire," very few were relevant. Libraries seem to survey themselves, their resources, procedures, communities, and financial needs endlessly. They also question each other without mercy. But, they seldom make inquiries of the patrons. The five studies which seemed to be 'right on the mark' originated in Canada and England and are not readily available to be reviewed.

These studies were: "Student Attitudes at Southhampton University" and a follow-up study, reported in the Journal of Documentation, Sept., 1963; a survey of students' attitudes done at the Bolton Technical College Library, Bolton, Lancashire; "What the Readers Really Need: Library Research," in the Times Educational Supplement, May 14, 1965; and "Student Library Survey at the University of British Columbia," in Feliciter, Summer, 1968.

Also cited was one of the most comprehensive studies of student

library requirements and use patterns ever made. Called "The Philadelphia Project," this study was developed by Lowell Martin of Columbia University, aided by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. There was no reliable information in this area, and Philadelphia's public, parochial, and independent schools needed guidelines in order to develop a plan to meet student library needs. Ten thousand students were surveyed, as were parents and library staffs, and the results, while not strictly applicable at the college level, show what wide-ranging and surprising information can come from going to the 'consumer' of the library product.

The overwhelming tendency of the libraries to survey themselves and each other, as institutions, is interesting in the light of the results of a study by K.L. Crum: What Does the Public Library User Really Want? The Accuracy of Library Personnel, Library Educators, and Library Board Members in Perceiving the Library-Related Wants of Public Library Patrons. The tone of most articles in the field is pontifical - written from the top down. The writers assume that they know what the patrons want, what service ought to be, and what resources should be provided. Mr. Crum's findings indicate, in short, that there were so many errors in the perceptions of the staff that:

> "...the implications of the study were that the library establishment was unable to perceive users' wants accurately or to estimate the relative importance which users attached to various library-related wants. A further implication was that change in library recruitment criteria, library school curricula, and public library service might be more sound if it were based upon the perceptions of the library establishment." (Dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1970)

More support for the idea that the patron should be a strong source of input in library planning is given by John B. Hall in his dissertation,

Analysis of Factors Related to Channels of Patron Input and Feedback for Policy Making Used by Academic Library Directors (Florida State University, 1972). Dr. Hall found that regardless of the background of the library director, or the size of the institution in which his library served, there was a strong tendency to agree or strongly agree with the following statements:

> "The role of the library patron should be one of an active source of input and feedback concerning library policy rather than a passive acceptor of library policy."
>
> "Library patrons should be more active sources of input and feedback than they presently are."
>
> "It is the responsibility of the librarian to establish channels and solicit input and feedback."

It is encouraging to note that a few people in the library field are gaining insight into the fact that they constitute an Establishment, with preconceived notions about themselves, their function, and their unchallenged position in society. Those who are asking for changes in these conceptions are just beginning to make an impression on the library world. Patricia Knapp, well known for her publications on the library and the junior college, began her effort in the 1950's, emphasizing the enormous importance of the integration of library instruction as an integral part of content courses, and emphasizing the necessity for a service orientation among academic librarians.

Still, reference services are notoriously bad in colleges, with many librarians defending the position that giving reference service prevents the student from having the educational experience of finding things for himself. This 'cop out' totally ignores the instructional contribution that good librarians make and reflects a basically anti-

patron attitude. Even professional librarians need help in strange libraries.

In "The Library" (Journal of Higher Education, December, 1970, p. 736) Ms. Knapp points out that students are far from unanimous in their praise of the new undergraduate libraries and feel that the reference services are not very helpful. As an example, the Undergraduate Library at the University of Illinois, which holds hundreds of thousands of volumes and serves thousands of students, has no reference librarian on the staff and provides no reference service. Unconcerned, the Librarian states that if anyone asks a question, someone at the circulation desk - possibly a student - will point in the general direction of the location of the material. The building is three stories deep, and is located at the front entrance of one of the most respected graduate schools of library science in the United States.

One of the basic assumptions of this study is that it is important for the library to know whether it is actually serving its community, not merely satisfying those who are currently using the library. In the T.N.C.C. study, an effort was made to elicit attitudes from all the faculty, and a sample of the student body - irrespective of their being library users.

The need to think of the problem in this way is demonstrated by two studies of public library patrons. Lora Long's dissertation, The Patron of the First Regional Library of Mississippi: His Needs, Desires and Recommendations Relating to the Public Library (University of Mississippi,

1972) shows the results of a survey circulated to patrons using the library. Long found a "very high level of user satisfaction...expressed by the sample patrons of the six libraries." This reveals only that those who continually use the library are reasonably satisfied with it.

In contrast to the approach used in Long's study, Charles Evans, in The Attitudes of Adults Toward the Public Library, and Their Relationship to Library Use (University of California, 1969) surveyed:

> "...the attitudes of middle class urban adults, toward the library provided for their use,...in order to determine whether or not a significant difference exists between the attitudes of those who use their public library and the attitudes of those who do not, which might account for non-use of the library by individuals within the latter group....The significance of the relationship between the subjects' attitudes and their use of the public library was found to vary with their concepts of the library's utility..."

It is not germaine to this study to explore what those concepts of utility were, but it is significant that such concepts, held by library non-users, may be among the factors that cause them to be non-users. To survey only library users is not helpful in telling the library director why other members of his community are not coming to the library.

SUMMARY

It becomes apparent in surveying the literature of library science that, even in this era of the over-polled consumer, very little has been done within the profession to find out what the library needs of the people of this country really are.

The situation is even worse in that traditional bastion of 'sink-or-swim' individualism, the college library. There have been faint glimmers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of a service oriented philosophy beginning to take shape in the writings of those concerned with the junior college, especially in the radical movement known as the Library-College Concept espoused by Louis Shores of Florida State University. Dean Shores views the college as a collection of books, and the purpose of education to teach the students to use and enjoy them. This view has had enough appeal in the last decade that it can at least be used as a point of reference to stimulate thought among academic deans and librarians.

Many writers, Wriston(1937), Shores (1967), Knapp (1959), Gaver (Wilson Library Bulletin, February, 1969), Lane (College and Research Libraries, July, 1966), Lyle (1963), and Scherer (1960) among them, have pointed out the enormous importance of the faculty's taking the responsibility for giving assignments that will require use of the library, so that the student will be motivated to become familiar with the library. Apparently the students are under competing pressures for their time, and are not generally motivated in any other way - certainly not be teas in the library and coy displays on the bulletin boards.

Many articles discuss the importance of library use skills to any educated person and deplore the lack of them in students, newly graduated teachers, and even among the faculty themselves. It is widely acknowledged that many of the large, introductory courses are still - even after so many pressures for innovation - textbook oriented and provide no motivation for the student to broaden his scope of reading and listening.

In the "ALA Standards for Junior College Libraries" published by the Association of College and Research Libraries of the American Library

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Association in 1960, emphasis was placed on the administrative input to the library: the number of volumes, number of staff members, percentage of institutional budget, floor space, seating space, and so on. However, in 1972, new guidelines were promulgated by the ACRL, The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT), and are presently under discussion by librarians and learning resource center directors in colleges of all types. At a recent southeastern regional meeting of junior college librarians in Huntsville, Alabama, it was pointed out that the new Guidelines emphasize the output side of the learning resources program: what the library is doing with what it has, and how it is supporting the instructional program of the college and in other ways enriching the lives and educational processes of the members of its community.

The philosophy of the staff of the T.N.C.C. library harmonizes with this latter view, and it was hoped that this study would clearly show in what ways the library is successful in its mission, and in what ways it can be improved.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

Faculty Questionnaire

1. There is no significant difference in the number of 'yes' and 'no' answers given by faculty members to Question 15, "Are the library holdings adequate for you to perform your teaching mission?"

2. There is no significant difference in the number of 'yes' and 'no' answers given by faculty who require the use of the library and faculty who do not require the use of the library to Question 15, "Are the library holdings adequate for you to perform your teaching mission?"

3. There is no significant difference in the number of 'always' and the number of 'sometimes' or 'never' answers given by faculty who require the use of the library and faculty who do not require use of the library to Question 14, "Do your students find the materials they need?"

4. There is no significant difference in the number of 'always' and the number of 'sometimes' or 'never' answers given by faculty to Question 7, "Do you receive the help you ask for?"

5. There is no significant difference in the number of 'always' and the number of 'sometimes' or 'never' answers given by faculty who require the use of the library and faculty who do not require use of the library to Question 7, "Do you receive the help you ask for?"

6. There is no significant difference in the number of 'yes' and 'no' responses checked in the 8 parts of Question 10, "What is the general condition of the library?"

7. There is no significant difference in the number of 'yes' and 'no' responses checked by faculty who require use of the library and faculty who do not require use of the library in the 8 parts of Question 10, "What is the general condition of the library?"

8. There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the library of faculty members who use the library frequently and those who use it infrequently.

9. There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the library of faculty members who require their students to use the library and faculty members who do not require their students to use the library.

10. There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the library of faculty members who place materials on reserve and faculty members who do not place materials on reserve.

Student Questionnaires

11. There is no significant difference in the number of students who feel that library holdings are adequate and the number who feel they are not adequate.

12. There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the adequacy of library holdings between students who use the library frequently and those who use it infrequently.

13. There is no significant difference in the number of students who believe that library service is 'very good' and the number who believe it is not 'very good'.

14. There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the library service between students who use the library frequently and those who use it infrequently.

15. There is no significant difference in the number of students who feel that library facilities are adequate and the number who feel they are inadequate.

16. There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the library facilities between students who use the library frequently and those who use it infrequently.

17. There is no significant difference in the number of students who believe that use of the library improves their grades and the number who believe that use of the library does not improve their grades.

18. There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the use of the library improving grades between students who use the library frequently and those who use it infrequently.

19. There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library by students whose professors require them to use the library and students who professors do not require them to use the library.

20. There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library by female students and by male students.

21. There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library by employed students and by non-employed students.

22. There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library by full time students and by part time students.

23. There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library by Freshmen, Sophomores, and Unclassified students.

24. There is no significant difference in attitude toward the library between students who use the library frequently and students who use it infrequently.

25. There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library between students who received orientation in the use of the library and those who did not.

26. There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library between students who received no orientation, those who received minimal orientation, and those who received thorough orientation in the use of the library.

27. There is no significant difference in attitude toward the library between students who received no orientation, those who received minimal orientation, and those who received thorough orientation in the use of the library.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

(1) It is assumed that the needs of the faculty and students of the college are basic reasons for the existence of this library, and that these individuals' evaluations of the library are valid criteria for developing library goals. This point of view is discussed in the background of the study.

(2) It is assumed that the library exists to serve all members of the T.N.C.C. community whether they are presently users of the library or not.

(3) It is assumed that the patrons are limited in their knowledge of the technical problems involved or of the reasons for their occasional frustration with library procedures.

(4) It is assumed that assistance in the use of the library is a desirable service for a college library to give, and that it helps rather than hinders the educational process.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

(1) A PATRON of the Thomas Nelson Community College library is a student (full time or part time), faculty member (full time or part time), staff member, or adult resident of the community who uses the library.

(2) A FULL TIME STUDENT is one carrying 12 or more credit hours of class work.

(3) A PART TIME STUDENT is one carrying 11 or less credit hours of class work.

(4) A FULL TIME FACULTY MEMBER teaches 12 or more credit hours.

(5) A PART TIME FACULTY MEMBER teaches 11 or less credit hours.

(6) The HOLDINGS of the library are its collection of books, periodicals, and audio-visual software.

(7) A FRESHMAN is a student with 49 credit hours or less.

(8) A SOPHOMORE is a student with 50 credit hours or more.

(9) An UNCLASSIFIED STUDENT is a student who does not have class standing.

(10) ATTITUDE is the expression of acceptance or rejection of designated statements on the questionnaire.

(11) ATTITUDE SCORE is the total number of points a respondent has accumulated as a result of his answers to questions in the areas of holdings, service, and facilities. Each possible response to these questions was given a point value for the purpose of ordering these responses.

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION AND TREATMENT OF DATA

Development of the Questionnaires

Dr. Allen stated in his thesis that he used the facilities of the research library of the American Library Association in Chicago. Even after a thorough search of the literature, he did not find any instruments that had been developed for studying the attitudes and utilization habits of students and faculty.

The librarian at T.N.C.C. developed the questionnaires used by the Self-Study Committee, incorporating some of the items used by Dr. Allen and developing several other items which would elicit information that would be useful in improving the administration of the library.

Administration of the Questionnaires

The Faculty Questionnaires were distributed at a general faculty meeting in the Fall of 1972 and 61 responses were received. This represents approximately 77 % of the full time faculty during that quarter. These responses were returned to the Librarian by the Self-Study Committee and tabulated by her.

The Student Questionnaires were given to the members of 12 classes, the classes selected by means of a random number table and matched against the complete listing of all credit courses given by the college in both daytime and evening. A total of 195 students responded, which represented 13 % of the full time equivalent students enrolled (1504) in T.N.C.C. in the spring quarter, 1973. The questionnaires were administered by

the teachers of these classes, and returned by them to the Librarian who tabulated the results.

Both instruments were designed and administered in a manner which assured the anonymity of the individuals responding.

For a question to be used for statistical analysis, a response of 75 o/o or more was considered to be necessary. This requirement was met for all questions.

The Data Collected

The student and faculty questionnaires had two purposes: to collect information about the respondents, and to measure their attitudes toward the library.

The information collected about the faculty was: (1) frequency of use of the library, (2) use of reserve materials, and (3) whether or not they required their students to use the library. All other questions concerned their satisfaction with library holdings, facilities, and services.

The student questionnaire collected the following personal data: (1) sex, (2) class status, (3) area of study (curriculum), (4) part or full time enrollment, (5) outside employment, (6) number of times respondent used the library in any one month, (7) whether instructors required use of the library, (8) reasons for using the library, (9) facilities they have used in the library.

The responses to the questions concerning adequacy of holdings, service, and facilities were given ordered number values so that relative

scores could be tabulated in each of these areas, and a total 'attitude score' be obtained for each respondent. (See questionnaires in Appendix)

The responses to the two questions on orientation were given number values of 2 for 'yes' and 0 for 'no', so that an 'orientation score' could be derived.

Both questionnaires asked the respondent to make suggestions toward improving the library. A large variety of comments were collected.

Treatment of Data

The twenty-seven hypotheses listed above were all tested by the Chi Square method of comparison for the total population studied. This method was chosen since it is most appropriate for non-parametric data, and for nominal data.

Differences at the five per cent level of significance were considered sufficient to reject the null hypotheses.

Because of the quantity of data, the computer services of the college were used. For this purpose, the Galfos Statistical Package was chosen. This program computed the frequency count, column and row total, chi square test, and level of significance.

Findings were taken directly from the computer print out, the degrees of freedom calculated, and the chi square table value compared with the computer results, so that the null hypotheses might be accepted or rejected.

The responses elicted concerning improvements to the library were not ammenable to statistical treatment, but were discussed and evaluated in the Analysis of Data section of this study.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

This section presents:

1. In table form (Tables 1 - 27), all the data collected and used to test the hypotheses, accompanied by the degrees of freedom, chi square value as shown on the computer print-out, and the significance level as shown on the Chi Square table.

2. In essay form, the responses elicited by the questions asking for suggestions for the improvement of the library (Student Questionnaire, No. 21; Faculty Questionnaire, Nos. 5 and 17).

TABLE 1 (Hypothesis 1)

Responses of faculty members to Question 15, "Are the library holdings adequate for you to perform your teaching mission?"

	Yes	No
Observed	42 (76%)	13 (24%)
Expected	27.5	27.5
df(1) X^2(7.1223)	.05 level of significance (3.841)	

TABLE 2 (Hypothesis 2)

Responses of faculty who require use of the library and faculty who do not require use of the library to Question 15, "Are the library holdings adequate for you to perform your teaching mission?"

	Yes	No
Requiring	28 (70%)	12 (30%)
Not Requiring	14 (93%)	1 (7%)

df(1) X^2(2.1248) .05 level of significance (3.841)

TABLE 3 (Hypothesis 3)

Number of 'always' and 'sometimes' or 'never' answers given by faculty who require use of the library and faculty who do not require use of the library to Question 14, "Do your students find the material they need?"

	Faculty Requiring Use of Library	Faculty Not Requiring Use of Library
'Always'	6 (15%)	4 (40%)
'Sometimes' or 'Never'	34 (85%)	6 (60%)

df(1) X^2(1.7578) .05 level of significance (3.841)

TABLE 4 (Hypothesis 4)

Number of 'always' and 'sometimes' or 'never' answers given by faculty to Question 7, "Do you receive the help you ask for?"

		'Always'	'Sometimes' or 'Never'
Observed		51 (96%)	2 (4%)
Expected		26.5	26.5
df(1)	X^2(26.5030)	.05 level of significance (3.841) .001 level of significance (10.827)	

TABLE 5 (Hypothesis 5)

Number of 'always' and 'sometimes' or 'never' answers given by faculty who require use of the library and faculty who do <u>not</u> require use of the library to Question 7, "Do you receive the help you ask for?"

		Faculty Requiring Use of Library	Faculty Not Requiring Use of Library
'Always'		37 (100%)	14 (87%)
'Sometimes' or 'Never'		0	2 (13%)
df(1)	X^2(1.9803)	.05 level of significance (3.841)	

TABLE 6 (Hypothesis 6)

Responses of faculty members to the eight parts of Question 10, "What is the general condition of the library?"

	Total 'Yes' (approving) answers	Total 'No' (disapproving) answers
Observed	225 (87%)	35 (13%)
Expected	130	130
df(1) x^2(78.4416)	.05 level of significance (3.841) .001 level of significance (10.827)	

TABLE 7 (Hypothesis 7)

Responses of faculty who require use of the library and faculty who do not require use of the library to the eight parts of Question 10, "What is the general condition of the library?"

	Total 'Yes' (approving) answers	Total 'No' (disapproving) answers
Requiring	153 (84%)	29 (16%)
Not Requiring	72 (92%)	6 (8%)
df(1) x^2(2.5155)	.05 level of significance (3.841)	

TABLE 8 (Hypothesis 8)

Responses of faculty members who used the library 'Daily', 'Weekly,' 'Monthly,' 'Irregularly,' and 'Never' to Questions 7 (service), 10 (supervision), 14 (holdings for students), and 15 (holdings for faculty).

	Frequency of Use by Faculty Members				
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Irregularly	Never
Total 'Yes" (Approving)	63 (76%)	150 (79%)	7 (88%)	108 (83%)	3 (60%)
Total 'No' (disapproving)	20 (24%)	40 (21%)	1 (12%)	22 (17%)	2 (40%)

df(4) x^2(3.2023) .05 level of significance (9.488)

TABLE 9 (Hypothesis 9)

Responses of faculty who require use of the library and faculty who do not require use of the library to Questions 7 (service), 10 (supervision), 14 (holdings for students), and 15 (holdings for faculty).

	Total 'Yes' (approving)	Total 'No' (disapproving)
Requiring Use	224 (75%)	75 (25%)
Not Requiring Use	104 (87%)	15 (13%)

df(1) x^2(7.1241) .05 level of significance (3.841)

TABLE 10 (Hypothesis 10)

Responses of faculty who place material on reserve and faculty who do not place material on reserve to Questions 7 (service), 10 (supervision), 14 (holdings for students), and 15 (holdings for faculty).

	Total 'Yes' (approving)	Total 'No' (disapproving)
Using Reserves	184 (75%)	61 (25%)
Not Using Reserves	143 (80%)	36 (20%)

df(1) x^2(1.0854) .05 level of significance (3.841)

TABLE 11 (Hypothesis 11)

Responses of students to Question 9, "Do you find the books you need?" and Question 10, "Do you find the magazines you need?" The answers were weighted: always (3), usually (2), sometimes (1), never (0). Answers to Questions 9 and 10 were totalled.

	Holdings Adequate (students scoring 6, 5, 4)	Holdings Inadequate (students scoring 3, 2, 1, 0)
Observed	109 (56%)	86 (44%)
Expected	97.5	97.5

df(1) x^2(1.1347) .05 level of significance (3.841)

TABLE 12 (Hypothesis 12)

'Attitude scores' on holdings of students who use the library 'over 20,' '20-16,' '15-11,' '10-6,' and '5-0,' times per month. 'Attitude scores' represent totals of weighted answers to Questions 9 and 10.

Attitude Score on Holdings	Frequency of Student Use: Number of Times Per Month				
	Over 20	20-16	15-11	10-6	5-0
	%	%	%	%	%
6	0	0	3	3	2
5	2 (11)	1 (7)	2 (14)	3 (14)	4 (8)
4	10	6	14	24	35
3	3 (68)	4 (66)	9 (66)	5 (66)	14 (64)
2	3	3	6	6	18
1	1 (21)	0 (27)	0 (20)	1 (20)	3 (28)
0	0	1	1	2	1
TOTALS	19(100%)	15(100%)	35(100%)	44(100%)	77(100%)

df(24) x^2(15.419) .05 level of significance (36.415)

TABLE 13 (Hypothesis 13)

Responses of students to Questions 13 (receiving service), 14 (rating service), and 15 (staff attitude). The answers were weighted: 4, 3, 2, 1, 0. Answer was 'Very Good' if total score was 6-9. It total score was 0-5, answer was not 'Very Good.'

	Students Rating Service 'Very Good'	Students Not Rating Service 'Very Good'
Observed	133 (70%)	56 (30%)
Expected	94.5	94.5
df(1)	X^2(15.4854)	.05 level of significance (3.841) .001 level of significance (10.827)

TABLE 14 (Hypothesis 14)

'Attitude Scores' on service of students who use the library 'Over 20,' '20-16,' '15-11,' '10-6,' and '5-0,' times per month. 'Attitude scores' represent totals of weighted answers to Questions 13, 14, and 15.

	Frequency of Student Use: Number of Times Per Month				
	Over 20	20-16	15-11	10-6	5-0
Attitude Score on Service					
9	5	4	4	12	9
8	1	1	4	1	5
	(74%)	(87%)	(77%)	(74%)	(61%)
Approving 7	5	3	7	13	18
6	3	5	12	6	15
5	2	1	5	4	10
4	1	1	2	3	9
3	1	0	1	1	5
	(26%)	(13%)	(23%)	(26%)	(39%)
Disapproving 2	1	0	0	3	5
1	0	0	0	0	1
TOTALS	19	15	35	43	77

df(32) X^2(24.4694) .05 level of significance (43.77)

TABLE 15 (Hypothesis 15)

Responses of students to Questions 19 (size), 20 (arrangement), and 21 (atmosphere). Answers were weighted: 2, 1, 0. A total score of 6-4 was considered 'Adequate'; a total score of 3-0 was considered 'Inadequate.'

	Students Rating Facilities 'Adequate'	Students Rating Facilities 'Inadequate'
Observed	148 (77%)	44 (23%)
Expected	96	96

df(1) x^2(29.2384) .05 level of significance (3.841)
.001 level of significance (10.827)

TABLE 16 (Hypothesis 16)

'Attitude scores' on facilities of students who use the library 'Over 20,' '20-16,' '15-11,' '10-6,' and '5-0' times per month. 'Attitude scores' represent totals of weighted answers to Questions 19, 20, and 21.

	Frequency of Student Use: Number of Times Per Month				
	Over 20	20-16	15-11	10-6	5-0
Attitude Scores on Facilities					
6	4	4	13	13	33
4	10	8	12	22	29
2	3	2	7	4	13
0	2	1	3	5	4

df(12) x^2(8.9121) .05 level of significance (21.026)

TABLE 17 (Hypothesis 17)

Responses of students to Quest 8, "Do you find that use of the library improves your grades?"

	Yes	No
Observed	129 (71%)	53 (29%)
Expected	91	91

df(1) X^2(15.7297) .05 level of significance (3.841)

TABLE 18 (Hypothesis 18)

Responses of students who use the library 'Over 20,' '20-16,' '15-11,' '10-6,' and '5-0' to Question 8, "Do you find that use of the library improves your grades?"

	Frequency of Student Use: Number of Times Per Month									
	Over 20		20-16		15-11		10-6		5-0	
Yes	17	(94%)	13	(93%)	25	(76%)	34	(81%)	40	(53%)
No	1	(6%)	;	(7%)	8	.(24%)	8	(19%)	35	(47%)

df(4) X^2(21.7506) .05 level of significance (9.488)
.001 level of significance (18.465)

TABLE 19 (Hypothesis 19)

Responses by students whose teachers require them to use the library and students whose teachers do not require them to use the library to Question 6, "In any one month, how many times do you enter the library?"

Frequency of Use	Required To Use Library	Not Required To Use Library
Over 20	13 (10%)	6 (8%)
20-16	13 (10%)	2 (3%)
15-11	27 (23%)	8 (11%)
10-6	31 (25%)	13 (19%)
5-0	40 (37%)	42 (59%)
TOTAL	124 (100%)	71 (100%)

df(4) x^2(15.0813) .05 level of significance (9.488)
.01 level of significance (13.277)

TABLE 20 (Hypothesis 20)

Responses of male and female students to Question 6, "In any one month, how many times do you enter the library?"

Frequency of Use	Males	Females	Total	
Over 20	12	7	19	(10%)
20-16	7	8	15	(8%)
15-11	15	20	35	(18%)
10-6	26	18	44	(22%)
5-0	40	42	82	(42%)

df(4) x^2(3.4741) .05 level of significance (9.488)

TABLE 21 (Hypothesis 21)

Responses of employed and non-employed students to Question 6, "In any one month, how many times do you enter the library?"

Frequency of Use	Employed Students	Non-Employed Students
Over 20	8	11
20-16	10	4
15-11	21	14
10-6	27	16
5-0	52	30

df(4) X^2(3.7682) .05 level of significance (9.488)

TABLE 22 (Hypothesis 22)

Responses of full-time students and part-time students to Question 6, "In any one month, how many times do you enter the library?"

Frequency of Use	Full-Time Students	Part-Time Students
Over 20	16 (12%)	3 (5%)
20-16	14 (10%)	1 (2%)
15-11	29 (21%)	6 (10%)
10-6	32 (24%)	12 (20%)
5-0	44 (33%)	38 (63%)
TOTALS	135 (100%)	60 (100%)

df(4) X^2(18.7302) .05 level of significance (9.488)
.001 level of significance (18.465)

TABLE 23 (Hypothesis 23)

Responses of Freshmen, Sophomores, and Unclassified students to Question 6, "In any one month, how many times do you enter the library?"

Frequency of Use	Freshmen	Sophomores	Unclassified
Over 20	14	5	0
20-16	4	8	3
15-11	16	16	3
10-6	22	18	4
5-0	17	45	20

df(8) X^2(28.6698) .05 level of significance (15.507)
.001 level of significance (26.125)

TABLE 24 (Hypothesis 24)

Total 'Attitude scores' of students who use the library 'Over 20,' '20-16,' '15-11,' '10-6,' and '5-0' times per month. Total 'attitude scores' represent the total points on weighted answers to Questions 9 and 10 (holdings), 13, 14, and 15 (service), and 19, 20, and 21 (facilities).

Attitude Scores of All Students

Frequency of Use	21-17	16-12	11-7	6-0	TOTALS
Over 20	5 (26%)	9 (48%)	5 (26%)	0	19 (100%)
20-16	4 (27%)	8 (53%)	3 (20%)	0	15 (100%)
15-11	10 (29%)	17 (48%)	8 (23%)	0	35 (100%)
10-6	12 (27%)	22 (50%)	8 (18%)	2 (5%)	44 (100%)
5-0	15 (19%)	43 (53%)	16 (20%)	6 (8%)	80 (100%)

df(12) X^2(7.3174) .05 level of significance (21.026)

TABLE 25 (Hypothesis 25)

Responses of students who received orientation and students who did not, to Question 6, "In any one month, how many times do you enter the library?"

Frequency of Use	Students Receiving Orientation	Students Not Receiving Orientation
Over 20	13 (13%)	5 (6%)
20-16	10 (9%)	5 (6%)
15-11	23 (22%)	12 (13%)
10-6	26 (25%)	18 (20%)
5-0	34 (32%)	48 (55%)

df(4) X^2(10.9483) .05 level of significance (9.488)

TABLE 26 (Hypothesis 26)

Responses of students receiving thorough, minimal, or no orientation in the use of the library to Question 6, "In any one month, how many times do you enter the library?" 'Orientation scores' represent totals of weighted answer to Questions 16 and 17. A score of 4 indicates 2 or more exposures to orientation.

Frequency of Use	Orientation Scores of Students		
	4	2	0
Over 20	7 (20%)	6 (8%)	6 (7%)
20-16	6 (17%)	4 (6%)	5 (6%)
15-11	5 (14%)	18 (24%)	12 (14%)
10-6	8 (23%)	18 (24%)	18 (21%)
5-0	9 (26%)	28 (38%)	45 (52%)

df(8) X^2(17.2185) .05 level of significance (15.507)

TABLE 27 (Hypothesis 27)

'Attitude scores' of students receiving thorough orientation (4), minimal orientation (2), or no orientation (0) in the use of the library.

	Orientation Scores		
'Attitude Scores'	4	2	0
21-17	15 (43%)	18 (24%)	13 (16%)
16-12	16 (46%)	47 (63%)	36 (44%)
11-7	4 (11%)	10 (13%)	26 (31%)
6-0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (9%)

df(6) X^2(27.9799) .05 level of significance (12.592)
.001 level of significance (22.457)

Data Not Subjected to Statistical Analysis

Student questions No. 18 and No. 21 asked for comments on the library hours of operation, and on the desirability of the library as a place to study. Of 195 responses, 24 students remarked that the library was too noisy. Some of their comments frankly complained that there was "noise and commotion," that "groups talked too much," or that the "instructors who have offices in the library act like they are in the commons." It was assumed that the library staff must have been included in this remark, since their offices open on the library and the workroom has no sound barrier.

Five students said the library was too small or crowded, and two requested more carrel space, or isolated areas for study.

There were a total of 16 comments about the hours of operation. Two students asked for hours after 5:00 on Friday night, and 10 requested hours on Saturday and/or Sunday. Four comments about "open later in the evening" or "open until 8:00" revealed that the respondent was not familiar with the present hours of operation.

Faculty questions No. 5 and No. 17 asked for any suggestions the respondent would care to make that might result in library improvement.

The largest group of suggestions concerned the collection. Twelve requests for more holdings were made, including: more depth and variety of materials, more reference and critical works, more copies of often used items, more back-issues of periodicals, more professional journals, more newspapers, and more fiction. Several asked for "more money for

books." A majority have requested that items be obtained and have seen their requests fulfilled; but one respondent felt that faculty requests should be filled more consistently and quickly. A faculty member also asked for the U.S. Census and Statistical Abstract of the U.S., which is held by the library.

Concerning the facilities, 15 said more room was needed, and others criticized the noise level, suggested better arrangement, and requested more carrels and private study areas.

In the area of service, two faculty asked for weekend hours of operation, and two asked for better control of the reserve system. One asked for an inter-library loan system for nearby colleges, apparently not aware that the library provided this service. Other comments were: "immediate shelving of new books," "computer print-out of holdings," and "retrieval system for information." These comments reflected some degree of unfamiliarity with present library operations.

Several comments were made about security, such as, "better security," "too many stolen books," "volunteers to check over students as they leave the library," "control of thievery," and "ordering of lost books more quickly."

On the positive side, the following comments were made:

"Excellent staff can provide needs if money is forthcoming."

"One of best aspects of institution...staff should be applauded."

"Keep up the good work."

"Library staff seems not only well-informed but pleasant and very cooperative."

"Service is adequate for size of physical plant."

ANALYSIS OF DATA

When the data was analyzed, the null hypothesis was accepted for the following hypotheses:

HYPOTHESIS 2: There is no significant difference in the number of 'yes' and 'no' answers given by faculty who require the use of the library and faculty who do not require the use of the library to Question 15, "Are the library holdings adequate for you to perform your teaching mission?"

The computer X^2 value (2.1248) was less than the table value (3.841) with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. The faculty members' opinions of library holdings was not significantly different, whether or not they required their students to use the library. Table 2 shows that 93% of the faculty not requiring use believed the holdings to be adequate, while only 70% of those requiring use believed the holdings to be adequate. This was the first indication, confirmed throughout the study, that patrons most familiar with the library were also the most cognizant of its shortcomings.

HYPOTHESIS 3: There is no significant difference in the number of 'always' and the number of 'sometimes' or 'never' answers given by faculty who require the use of the library and faculty who do not require use of the library to Question 14, "Do your students find the materials they need?"

The computer X^2 value (1.7578) was lower than the table value (3.841) with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. The faculty members' opinions of the adequacy of holdings to meet student needs did not vary significantly, whether or not they required the use of the library. However, Table 3 shows that 40% of the faculty who do not require use of the library believed that their students 'always' found what they needed, as compared with only 15% of the faculty who do require use of the library. Again, it was noted that the patrons more familiar with the library reflected greater knowledge of its limitations on this questionnaire.

HYPOTHESIS 5: There is no significant difference in the number of 'always' and the number of 'sometimes' or 'never' answers given by faculty who require the use of the library and faculty who do not require use of the library to Question 7, "Do you receive the help you ask for?"

The computer X^2 value (1.9803) was less than the table value (3.841), with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. Faculty members' opinions about library service did not vary significantly, whether or not they required use of the library. Table 5 shows that 100% of the faculty requiring use state that they 'always' receive the service they ask for, while 88% of the faculty not requiring use 'always' receive the service they ask for. While the difference was not significant between these groups, the responses indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the library service.

HYPOTHESIS 7: There is no significant difference in the number of 'yes' and 'no' responses checked by faculty who require use of the library and faculty who do not require use of the library in answer to Question 10, "What is the general condition of the library?"

The computer value (2.5155) was less than the table value (3.841), with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. This question asked the respondents to state whether or not they thought the library was attractive, clean, conveniently arranged, had proper temperature control, was quiet enough, and was supervised well. Table 7 shows that 92% of the responses of faculty who did not require use of the library were approving, while only 84% of the responses of faculty who did require use were approving. While the difference between the groups was not statistically significant, this observation reenforced the inference that more criticism came from the more frequent patrons.

HYPOTHESIS 8: There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the library of faculty members who use the library frequently and those who use it infrequently.

The computer X^2 value (3.2023) was less than the table value (9.488), with 4 degrees of freedom, at the .05 level. The total of 'yes' (approving) answers to Questions 7 (service), 10 (supervision), 14 (holdings for students), and 15 (holdings for faculty) did not vary significantly between those groups of faculty using the library daily, weekly, monthly, irregularly, or never. Table 8 shows, however, that the highest percentage of 'no' (disapproving) answers (24%) were received from the group which stated that they used the library 'daily'. (Responses on service by faculty who stated they 'never' used the library were discarded as not applicable.) Again, it was indicated that the patrons using the library more frequently tended to give fewer approving responses to this questionnaire.

HYPOTHESIS 10: There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the library of faculty members who place materials on reserve and faculty members who do not place materials on reserve.

The computer X^2 value (1.0854) was less than the table value (3.841), with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. There was no significant difference in attitude toward the library of faculty members who used the reserve system and those who did not. Table 10 shows that faculty using the reserve system gave 75% approving answers, while faculty not using the system gave 80% approving answers. In conjunction with this observation, it was noted that one faculty member suggested that the reserve system needed better organization and control. It was again noted that patrons who used the system were more likely to criticize them. However, a high degree of approval of the library was evident.

HYPOTHESIS 11: There is no significant difference in the number of students who feel that the library holdings are adequate and the number who feel they are not adequate.

The computer X^2 value (1.1347) was less than the table value (3.841), with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. There were two questions about library holdings on the student questionnaire: No. 9, "Do you find the books you need?", and No. 10, "Do you find the magazines that you need?". Both questions could be answered __Always__Usually__Sometimes __Never, and the answers were weighted from 3 (Always) to 0 (Never). An answer of 'adequate' was defined as a total score on these two questions of 4, 5, or 6. An answer of 'inadequate' was defined as a score of 3, 2, 1, or 0. Table 11 shows that 56% of the students stated they 'usually' or 'always' found the items desired. It was also noted that students stated they found books they needed more often than they found magazines.

HYPOTHESIS 12: There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the adequacy of library holdings between students who use the library frequently and those who use it infrequently.

The computer X^2 value (15.419 was less than the table value (36.415), with 24 degrees of freedom, at the .05 level. The 'attitude score on holdings' for this hypothesis was derived in the same manner explained in Hypothesis 11 (see above). Table 12 shows that when 'attitude scores' were grouped into 'high' 'medium' and 'low' scores, approximately two-thirds of the responses clustered in the 'medium' range for all frequency groups. Most students indicated materials were found 'usually' or 'sometimes'.

HYPOTHESIS 14: There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the library service between students who use the library frequently and those who use it infrequently.

The computer X^2 value (24.4694) is less than the table value (greater than 43.77), with 32 degrees of freedom at the .05 level. The 'attitude score toward service' was derived from the responses checked for Questions 13 (receiving service), 14 (rating the service), and 15 (staff attitude). Responses were valued from approving to disapproving, in descending order: 3, 2, 1, 0. A total score on these 3 questions of 6-9 was considered an approving response. A total score of 5-0 was considered a disapproving response.

Table 14 shows that the grouping of the scores into 'approving' and 'disapproving' categories did not indicate any important differences between the frequency groups. Slightly over 70% of the responses were approving responses, which indicated a fairly high degree of satisfaction with library service. (See also Table 13)

HYPOTHESIS 16: There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the library facilities between students who use the library frequently and those who use it infrequently.

The computer X^2 value (8.9121) was less than the table value (21.026), with 12 degrees of freedom, at the .05 level. The 'attitude score toward facilities' was derived from responses checked for Questions 19 (size), 20 (arrangement), and 21 (atmosphere). Responses were valued, from approving to disapproving, in descending order, 2, 1, and 0. A total score on these 3 questions of 6-4 was considered 'adequate' and a total score from 3-0 was considered 'inadequate'. Table 16 shows that the

responses tended to cluster in the upper middle range for all frequency groups. 77% of responses were approving and 23% were disapproving.

HYPOTHESIS 20: There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library by female students and by male students.

The computer X^2 value (3.4741) was less than the table value (9.488), with 4 degrees of freedom, at the .05 level. There is no significant difference in use of the library by female or by male students. Table 20 shows the percentage of responses which fell into each frequency grouping.

HYPOTHESIS 21: There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library by employed students and by non-employed students.

The computer X^2 value (3.7682) was less than the table value (9.488), with 4 degrees of freedom, at the .05 level. There is no significant difference in library use by employed or non-employed students.

HYPOTHESIS 24: There is no significant difference in attitude toward the library between students who use the library frequently and students who use it infrequently.

The computer X^2 value (7.3174) was less than the table value (21.026), with 12 degrees of freedom, at the .05 level. The attitude toward the library of students who used the library frequently did not differ significantly from the attitude toward the library of students who used it infrequently. Observation of Table 24 shows that 'attitude scores' of students in all frequency groups tended to cluster in the 16-12, or moderately high, range.

The 'attitude scores' of the respondents were the total points each

respondent received for the answers which he checked for Questions 9 and 10 (holdings), 13, 14, and 15 (service), and 19, 20, and 21 (facilities).

When the data was analyzed, the null hypothesis was rejected for the following hypotheses:

HYPOTHESIS 1: There is no significant difference in the number of 'yes' and 'no' answers given by faculty members to Question 15, "Are the library holdings adequate for you to perform your teaching mission?"

The computer X^2 value (7.1223) was greater than the table value (3.841), with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. There was a significant difference in the number of faculty who rated the holdings adequate for their own use, 76%, and the number who rated the holdings not adequate, 24%. See Table 1.

HYPOTHESIS 4: There is no significant difference in the number of 'always' and the number of 'sometimes' or 'never' answers given by faculty to Question 7, "Do you receive the help you ask for?"

The computer X^2 value (26.5030) was greater than the table value (3.841), with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. The computer value (26.5030) was also greater than the table value (10.827), with 1 degree of freedom, at the .001 level of significance. Slightly over 96% of the faculty members responded that they 'always' received the service they asked for.

HYPOTHESIS 6: There is no significant difference in the number of 'yes' and 'no' responses checked in the 8 parts of Questions 10, "What is the general condition of the library?"

The computer X^2 value (78.4416) was greater than the table value (3.841), with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. The computer value

(78.4416) was also greater than the table value (10.827), with 1 degree of freedom, at the .001 level. There was a significantly greater number of approving responses (87%) than of disapproving responses (13%) in regard to the condition of the library. These questions concerned the attractiveness, cleanliness, arrangement, heating, quietness, and general supervision of the library.

HYPOTHESIS 9: There is no significant difference in the attitude toward the library of faculty members who require their students to use the library and faculty members who do not require their students to use the library.

The computer X^2 value (7.1241) was greater than the table value (3.841), with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. The faculty who do not require their students to use the library show a significantly higher total percentage of 'yes' (approving) answers to Questions 7 (service), 10 (facilities), 14 (holdings for students), and 15 (holdings for faculty), than faculty who do require the use of the library. Table 9 shows that 87% of responses of faculty requiring use, and 75% of responses of faculty not requiring use were approving. This indicated a high attitude of approval toward the library by the total faculty, and was consistent with other findings of the study. Also consistent was the finding that faculty having the least familiarity with the library gave the highest number of approving responses.

HYPOTHESIS 13: There is no significant difference in the number of students who believe that library service is 'very good' and the number who believe it is not 'very good'.

The computer X^2 value (15.4854) was greater than the table value (3.841) with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. It was noted that the computer

X^2 value (15.4854) was also greater than the table value (10.827) with 1 degree of freedom, at the .001 level. Table 13 shows that 70% of the students gave an approving response to the questions on service. This response was derived from the total score on the 3 service questions: 13 (receiving service), 14 (rating the service), and 15 (staff attitude). The answers to these questions were rated in descending order of approval, with values of 3, 2, 1, and 0. A total score on these questions was considered an approving response if it was in the range 6-9, and a disapproving response if it was in the 0-5 range.

HYPOTHESIS 15: There is no significant difference in the number of students who feel that library facilities are adequate and the number who feel they are inadequate.

The computer X^2 value (29.2384) was greater than the table value (3.841) with 1 degree of freedom, at the .05 level. The computer value was also greater than the table value (10.827) at the .001 level. Table 3 shows that 77% of the respondents indicated they felt the facilities were adequate. The answers to the 3 questions about facilities: 19 (size), 20 (arrangement), and 21 (atmosphere for study), were given a descending value of 2, 1, and 0. The 'adequate' responses represented a total score of 4-6 on these questions, while an 'inadequate response represented a total score of 0-3.

HYPOTHESIS 17: There is no significant difference in the number of students who believe that use of the library improves their grades and the number who believe that use of the library does not improve their grades.

The computer X^2 value (15.7297) was greater than the table value (3.841) with 1 degree of freedom at the .05 level. The computer value was also higher than the table value (10.827) with 1 degree of freedom at the

HYPOTHESIS 22: There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library by full time students and by part time students.

The computer X^2 value (18.7302) was greater than the table value (9.488) with 4 degrees of freedom at the .05 level, and also greater than the table value (18.465) at the .001 level. There was a significant difference between the two groups. Table 22 shows that the percentage of users in the higher frequency groups was significantly greater for the full time students.

HYPOTHESIS 23: There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library by Freshmen, Sophomores, and Unclassified students.

The computer X^2 value (28.6698) was greater than the table value (15.507) with 8 degrees of freedom at the .05 level, and it was also greater than the table value (26.125) at the .001 level. There was a significant difference between the groups.

Table 23 shows that a higher percentage of Freshmen responded in the higher frequency groups and a lower percentage in the lowest frequency group, than did Sophomores or Unclassified students. This statement held true, also, for Sophomores as compared to Unclassified students. It was found that Freshmen exhibited a higher use pattern than Sophomores, and Sophomores exhibited a higher use pattern than Unclassified students.

HYPOTHESIS 25: There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library between students who received orientation in the use of the library and those who did not.

The computer X^2 value (10,9483) was greater than the table value (9.488) with 4 degrees of freedom, at the .05 level. There was a significant difference between the group of students who had received orientation,

and the group of students who had not, in their frequency of library use.

Table 25 shows a consistently higher pattern of use in the higher frequency groups by the students who received orientation. These students exhibited a higher percentage of members in the 4 top frequency groups, and a lower percentage of members in the lowest frequency group (0-5).

HYPOTHESIS 26: There is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the library between students who received no orientation, those who received minimal orientation, and those who received thorough orientation in the use of the library.

The computer X^2 value (17.2185) was greater than the table value (15.507) with 8 degrees of freedom at the .05 level. There was a significant difference in the frequency of use of the library between the groups who received the different degrees of orientation.

The 'orientation scores' were derived by giving value of '2' and '0' to the 'yes' and 'no' answers to the orientation questions, No. 16 and No. 17. Three total values were possible: 4, 2, and 0. A score of 4 reflected two or more exposures to orientation in the use of the library. A score of 2 reflected at least 1 exposure.

Table 26 shows the numbers and percentages of students in each orientation category, grouped by frequency of use of the library.

HYPOTHESIS 27: There is no significant difference in attitude toward the library between students who received no orientation, those who received minimal orientation, and those who received thorough orientation in the use of the library.

The computer X^2 value (27.9799) was greater than the table value (12.592) with 6 degrees of freedom at the .05 level, and also greater than the table value (22.457) at the .001 level. There was a significant

difference between the groups.

Table 27 shows the numbers and percentages of students in each orientation category, grouped by their 'attitude scores.' Those with the high orientation scores exhibited higher 'attitude scores,' those with medium orientation scores exhibited medium 'attitude scores,' and those with low orientation scores exhibited lower 'attitude scores.'

Since it was found that students with high orientation scores used the library more than students with low orientation scores, and it was also found that there is no significant difference in attitude toward the library of students who used the library frequently and those who used it infrequently, it was considered possible that the orientation process influenced in a positive way not only frequency of use of the library, but also the attitude of the student toward the library.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

During the school year, 1972-1973, the staff of Thomas Nelson Community College conducted a self-study as part of the process of sustaining accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

The Library participated in this self-study by developing two questionnaires, one form for the faculty, and one form for the students. These instruments were administered by the Self-Study Committee to a meeting of faculty members, and by individual faculty members to members of classes chosen at random.

They were administered to 61 (77%) of the 79 full time faculty members and to 195 (13%) of a student body of 1504 full time equivalent students. These students were members of 12 classes chosen at random from the entire list of course offerings for credit given by the college, both during the day and the evening.

This questionnaire was not biased by being given only to those people who were patrons of the library. Rather, it was given to a sample of the whole community of persons whom the library is eatablished to serve. It was hoped that this procedure would determine ways by which the library could become more effective.

The questionnaires first determined a number of facts about the status and personal characteristics of the respondents (faculty, student, curriculum, sex, etc.). It then asked for frequency in use of the library, a variety of questions to elicit attitudes of the respondent, and suggestions for improvement of the library and its services. (See sample questionnaires in Appendix)

These data were tabulated and used to test 27 hypotheses by the chi square analysis.

The null hypothesis was accepted for the following hypotheses: 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 20, 21, and 24. The null hypothesis was rejected for the following hypotheses: 1, 4, 6, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 27.

Faculty attitudes on holdings:

The faculty had a fairly high opinion of the library holdings, 76% responding that they were adequate for their teaching mission. (Table 1) Of those faculty requiring use of the library, 70% believed holdings were adequate, and of the faculty not requiring use of the library, 93% thought they were adequate. (Table 2) Of faculty requiring use of the library only 15% thought their students 'always' found the materials they needed, while 40% of faculty not requiring use of the library believed their students 'always' found needed items.(Table 3)

These results indicated that the faculty who were assumed to receive the most information from their students about the library were most aware of its limitations.

Faculty attitudes on service:

In the area of service, 96% of the faculty stated they 'always' received the service they asked for. (Table 4) Of those faculty requiring use of the library, 100% reported 'always' receiving service. Of those not requiring use of the library, 88% said they 'always' received requested service. (Table 5) Both of these sets of data showed a high degree of satisfaction with the service given by the library.

Faculty attitude on facilities:

Faculty responses to questions about the general condition of the library elicited 87% approving answers and 13% disapproving. Those faculty who required use of the library, showed 84% approving answers, and those who did not require use of the library gave 92% approving answers. While this showed a high degree of approval of the condition and supervision of the library, it reenforced the observation that familiarity with the library tended to prompt criticism of it. (Tables 6 and 7)

Faculty attitude toward the library as a whole:

The highest percentage (24%) of disapproving responses was received from the group of faculty who stated that they used the library 'daily.' (Table 8) The faculty who required use of the library gave 75% approving responses, and the faculty who did not require use of the library gave 87% approving responses. (Table 9) Of faculty using reserve materials, 75% of their responses were approving, compared to 80% approving responses from faculty not using reserve materials. (Table 10)

On the whole, the responses supported the conclusion that the Thomas Nelson Community College faculty had a highly approving attitude toward the library. The criticisms elicited from the faculty (see Presentation of Data: Data not subjected to statistical analysis) which dealt with the facilities are expected to be satisfied by a building presently under construction. The criticisms of the collection involved the need for purchases in depth in various areas, and the building of the periodicals backfile.

Some suggestions about the collection and the operations of the library reflected a lack of familiarity with the library. Several remarks

which reflected concern for library security revealed that the faculty were not aware that the library has a very low loss rate, 1.4%, although it has minimal security procedures and circulates most of the items it holds.

Six faculty (10%) noted trouble getting audio-visual equipment because of scheduling conflicts or equipment failure. Since this survey was made, an audio-visual coordinator has been added to the staff and new systems have been developed. Procedures for scheduling use of audio-visual hardware, and procuring audio-visual software have been established by the Learning Resource Center, of which the library is an integral unit.

Student attitude on holdings:

There was not a significant finding about the student attitude on holdings: 56% responded that they 'always' or 'usually' found books or magazines they wanted. (Table 11) A slightly higher level of success was reported finding books than finding magazines: 18 (9%) 'always' found books; 16 (8%) 'always' found magazines.

The 'always' responses were very low, much lower than the faculty estimate of the students' "hit rate". (Table 3)

Student attitude on service:

Student respondents gave 70% approving answers to Questions 13 (receiving service), 14 (rating service), and 15 (staff attitude). (Table 13) The answers to these 3 questions were weighted from 3 ('always' or 'excellent') to) ('never' or 'unsatisfactory'). For a response to be 'approving' the student's total score had to be in the 6-9 point range. This was considered to be a high standard for 'approval' and represented

consistent responses of 'very good' or 'excellent.'

Student attitude on facilities:

Student respondents gave 77% approving answers to Questions 19 (size), 20 (arrangement), and 21 (general atmosphere). The 'yes' and 'no' answers to these questions were given the values of '2' and '0', so that the highest possible score was '6'. Approving responses had to be in the range of 4-6 total points. (Table 15) There was no significant difference between frequency groups in their attitude toward the facilities.

Student attitude on grade improvement through use of the library:

Responses indicated that 71% of the students surveyed believed that use of the library improved their grades, and 29% did not. The two groups differed at the .001 level of significance. (Table 17) There was also a significant difference in the attitude on grade improvement between the 5 frequency groups. In the group which stated they used the library 'over 20' times per week, 94% believed that use of the library improved their grades. Only 54% of the respondents in the '0-5' times per week group believed this. (Table 18) There was a difference between these groups at the .001 level of significance.

This finding raised the questions: does use of the library, in fact, improve the grades of the frequent users; or is this a self-fulfilling prophecy? Do the less frequent users need to be enlightened and motivated; or is their judgment about the usefulness of the library as valid as that of the more frequent users? Is the real purpose of using a library the improvement of grades? Are the benefits of use (if any) measurable?

Frequency of student use of the library as related to other factors:

Students who were required by their professors to use the library, used it significantly more often than those who were not so required. (Table 19) Those required to use the library show higher percentages of responses in the higher frequency groups, and lower percentages of responses in the lowest frequency group.

There was no significant difference in frequency of use of the library between male and female students. (Table 20)

There was no significant difference in frequency of use of the library between employed and non-employed students. (Table 21)

Full time students used the library significantly more often than part time students. These groups differed at the .001 level of significance. (Table 22)

There was a significant difference in frequency of use of the library between Freshmen, Sophomores, and Unclassified students. (Table 23) Freshmen used the library more than Sophomores, and Sophomores used it more than Unclassified students.

There was no significant difference in total attitude toward the library between the different frequency groups. (Table 24) Frequency of use did not seem to impair or improve student attitude.

The effect of orientation on student use and attitude:

The study showed a consistently higher pattern of use by students who had received orientation. (Table 25) Furthermore, the more orientation a students stated he had received, the more frequently he used the library. (Table 26) In addition, the more orientation a student stated he had received,

the higher 'attitude score' he had on the questionnaire. (Table 27) These findings were inconsistent with previous findings that there was no significant difference in attitude between the frequent and infrequent users, and raised the possibility that orientation also affected the student's attitude toward the library in a positive way.

Student suggestions for library improvement:

Twenty-four (12%) of the 195 respondents complained that the library was too noisy. There were 12 requests for Friday night or weekend hours. Seven students stated that more space and private study areas were needed. These last complaints will be satisfied when the new building is completed. Trial operation for longer hours has shown that the library is rarely patronized when classes are not in session.

Implications of this study for Thomas Nelson Community College:

1. The most important findings with implications for the library and the administration as well, were that the students who received orientation in the use of the library: (a) used the library more, and (b) had better attitudes toward the library.

Furthermore, the more exposure the students had to orientation, the more they used the library. That is, students receiving the brief introduction to the library given in the first weeks of school evidently benefited from that small help; but those who also received instruction through their classes, in the classroom or in the library, showed significantly more use of the library.

In addition, those students who were required by their professors to use the library used it significantly more often. Evidently, motivation

to use the library must be incorporated into the instructional program.

The library staff is not concerned with the use of the library as a means of bolstering their statistics of use. However, if it is felt by the faculty and administration - as it is felt by the library staff - that the use of auxiliary materials, and the training in the use of the library is a necessary and enriching part of a college education, then this study would support a policy of providing instruction in the use of the library as a part of every possible course. The library staff is prepared to give instruction in the use of the library, both in the library and in the classroom, and is willing to monitor in the library any projects on library use that the faculty wishes to assign.

2. The faculty requests for more depth and variety in the collection must be met by conscientious attention of the Librarian to faculty requests and by continuous staff development of the collection. The growth rate will improve when the new facility is occupied.

The faculty need to recognize the responsibility they have for developing the library collection in their areas of specialty, and to take the time to recommend for purchase both books or periodicals, and audio-visual materials.

Some suggestions about the collection and the operations of the library reflected a lack of familiarity with the library. Each year, preferably in the fall when new faculty come on the staff, a library staff member should review library policies before a general faculty meeting, or in Division meetings. Items to be covered should include: development of the collection, acquisition of audio-visual software,

the reserve system, security policies, circulation policies, and the orientation services provided by the staff. This annual review is also needed to provide a means of personal acquaintance between the faculty and the library staff members, and a meeting of the minds of the two groups on their respective roles in the educational processes at T.N.C.C.

3. The Librarian should continue to emphasize service in the library, in an effort to help the students to be more successful in their search for materials. There must also be a conscientious effort to respond to the students' complaints about the noise level.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Kenneth. An Investigation of Student and Faculty Attitudes and Their Utilization of the Community College Library. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1970.

American Library Association. Student Use of Libraries. Chicago, 1964.

Association of College and Research Libraries. "ALA Standards for Junior College Libraries," College and Research Libraries, XXI (May, 1960), 200-206.

Association of College and Research Libraries. "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Program," College and Research Libraries, XXXIII (December, 1972), 305-315.

Behling, Orlando, and Cudd, Kermit. "A Library Looks at Itself," College and Research Libraries, XXVIII (November, 1967), 416-422.

Branscomb, Bennett Harvie. Teaching with Books: A Study of College Libraries. Chicago: Association of American Colleges, 1940.

Burnett, Collins. The Community Junior College: An Annotated Bibliography. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1968.

Carlsen, William H. "Measures of Library Excellence," Improving College and University Teaching, XII (Spring, 1964), 69.

Downie, N.M., and Heath, R.W. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Evans, Charles. Middle Class Attitudes and Public Library Use. Libraries Unlimited, 1970.

Fletcher, Charlotte. "The Library-Centered College." The Library-College. Edited by Louis Shores, Robert Jordan, and John Harvey. Drexel Library School Series, No. 16. Philadelphia: Drexel Institute of Technology, 1966.

Gaver, Mary V. "The Librarian in the Academic Community - a New Breed?" Wilson Library Bulletin, XLIII (February, 1969), 540-545.

Griffith, Alice B. Selected Bibliography on Junior College Libraries, 1955-1967. Chicago: American Library Association, 1968.

Goldhor, Herbert, Ed. Research Methods in Librarianship: Measurement and Evaluation. Champagne, Illinois: University of Illinois School of Library Science, 1968.

Harvey, John F. "The Role of the Junior College Library," College and Research Libraries, XVII (May, 1966), 227-232.

Harvey, John F. "Role of the Junior College Library in Classroom-Instruction," Junior College Journal, XXXII (April, 1962), 441-447.

Harvey, John F. "State of the College Library Art," Library Journal LXXXVI (February 1, 1961), 513-515.

Hirsch, Felix E. "Evaluation Trends," Library Trends XIV (October, 1965), 199-200.

Hirsch, Felix E. "New Horizons for Junior College Libraries," Library Journal LXXXV (June 15, 1960), 2372-2375.

Holley, E.G. "Effective Librarian-Faculty Relations'ips." Illinois Libraries 43 (December, 1961), 731-741.

Hostrop, Richard W. Teaching and the Community College Library. Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1968.

Jain, A.K. "Sampling and Short-Period Usage in the Purdue Library," College and Research Libraries, XXVII (May, 1966), 211-218.

Johnson, B. Lamar, Ed. The Junior College Library. Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 3. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, 1966.

Jones, Robert. "Administrative Relationships of the Library and the Junior College," Junior College Journal, XXIX (February, 1959), 324-328.

Jordan, Robert. "The Library-College, A Merging of the Identity of the Faculty with that of the Library." The Library-College. Edited by Louis Shores, Robert Jordan, and John Harvey. Drexel Library School Series, No. 16. Philadelphia: Drexel Institute of Technology, 1966.

Josey, E.J. "Role of the College Library Staff in Instruction in the Use of the Library," College and Research Libraries, XXIII (November, 1962), 492-498.

Joyce, W.D. "Student Grades and Library Use: a Relationship Established." Library Journal LXXXVI (February, 1961), 832-833.

"A Kaleidoscope View of Library Research," Wilson Library Bulletin, XLI (May, 1967), 896-949.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1964.

Knapp, Patricia B. College Teaching and the College Library. Chicago: American Library Association, 1959.

Knapp, Patricia B. "The Library," The Journal of Higher Education (December, 1970), 736.

Knapp, Patricia B. The Monteith College Library Experiment. New York: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1966.

Lane, Gorham. "Assessing the Undergraduates' Use of the University Library," College and Research Libraries, XXVII (July, 1966), 277-282.

Long, Lora. The Patron of the First Regional Library of Mississippi: His Needs, Desires and Recommendations Relating to the Public Library. Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Mississippi, 1972.

Lyle, Guy R. The Administration of the College Library. New York: H.W. Wilson Company, 1961.

Lyle, Guy R. The President, the Professor, and the College Library. New York: H.W. Wilson Company, 1963.

Mapp, Edward. "Instructor-Librarian Collaboration in a Community College," Junior College Journal, XXVIII (March, 1958), 404-406.

Millis, Charlotte H. "Toward a Philosophy of Academic Librarianship, a Library-College Bibliography," The Library-College Journal, IV (Summer, Winter, Spring, 1971).

North, R. Stafford. "A Demonstration of the Impact of Certain Instructional Changes in the Attitudes and Practices of Both Students and Faculty," unpublished study. Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Christian College, 1967.

Purdue University Libraries Staff Association. Purdue University Libraries Attitude Survey, 1959-1960. Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, 1964.

Scherer, Henry H. Faculty-Librarian Relations in Selected Liberal Arts Colleges. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1960.

Scott, W. Wiley, "The Library's Place in the Junior College," Library Trends, XIV (October, 1965), 187-189.

Sheehan, Sister Helen. "Students and the Library," Drexel Library Quarterly, IV (January, 1968), 45-49.

Shores, Louis. "Library-College U.S.A.," A.L.A. Bulletin (December, 1969), 1547.

Shores, Louis. "The Undergraduate and His Library," The Library in the University: The University of Tennessee Library Lectures, 1949-1966. Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1967.

Sutton, H.L. "Is the Library the Heart of the College?" Saturday Review XLV (April 21, 1962), 62.

Tanis, Norman E. "Library Services for Kansas State College: Planning for the Next Decade by Means of a College-Wide Series of Questionnaires," unpublished study. Pittsburg, Kansas: Kansas State College, 1968.

Tanis, Norman E., and Powers, Milton. "Profiles of Practice in the Public Junior College Library," College and Research Libraries, XXVIII (September, 1967), 331-336.

Thornton, James W. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Wheeler, Helen Rippier. The Community College Library, A Plan for Action. Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1965.

Wriston, Henry M. The Nature of a Liberal College. Appleton, Wisconsin: Lawrence College Press, 1937.

Wynar, B. Research Methods in Library Science. New York: Libraries Unlimited, 1971.

FACULTY/STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

STANDARD VI - LIBRARY

Indicate your status _____Faculty _____Staff

1. How often do you use the library? _____Daily _____Weekly
   _____ Monthly _____Irregularly _____Not at all

2. Have you ever requested audio-visual aids which were not available? If yes, explain.
   _____ Yes _____ No

3. Have you ever requested that items be obtained for the library?
   _____ Yes _____ No

4. Were they obtained? If not, why not?
   _____ Yes _____ No

5. What do you believe the library needs for improvement? (List any items or classes of items.)

6. Do you ever ask the librarian to help you?
   _____Often _____Sometimes _____Never

7. Do you receive the help you ask for?
   _____Always _____Sometimes _____Never

8. Are the library hours convenient for you? If no, explain.
   _____Yes _____No

9. Have you ever needed the library when it was closed?
   _____Yes _____No

10. What is the general condition of the library? (Check as many as you desire.)

_____Yes _____No Attractive
_____Yes _____No Clean
_____Yes _____No Conveniently arranged
_____Yes _____No Properly ventilated
_____Yes _____No Proper temperature control
_____Yes _____No Is the library quiet enough?
_____Yes _____No Is the library too quiet?
_____Yes _____No Is the supervision good?

11. Do you require your students to use the library?
_____Yes _____No

12. Do you encourage your students to use the library?
_____Yes _____No

13. Does the use of the library improve the grades of your students?
_____Yes _____No _____Don't know

14. Do your students find the material they need?
_____Always _____Sometimes _____Never

15. Are the library holdings adequate for you to perform your teaching mission? (If no, explain.)
_____Yes _____No

16. Do you place material on reserve?
_____Yes _____No

17. Please offer any suggestions you have for the improvement of library service.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE: TNCC LIBRARY

1. I am a _____ full-time, _____ part-time student.

2. Sex: _____ male; _____ female.

3. Class: _____ Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ unclassified.

4. Area of study (curriculum): _____.

5. Are you employed at a job in addition to attending TNCC? _____ Yes _____ No.

6. In any one month how many times do you enter the library?
   _____ 1 to 5 times
   _____ 6 to 10 times
   _____ 10 to 15 times
   _____ 16-20 times
   _____ over 20 times

7. Do any of your instructors require you to use the library? _____ Yes _____ No.

8. Do you find that use of the library improves your grades? _____ Yes _____ No.

9. Are you able to locate the books you need?
   _____ Always _____ Usually _____ Sometimes _____ Never

10. Are you able to locate the magazines that you need?
    _____ Always _____ Usually _____ Sometimes _____ Never

11. Have you ever checked out A-V materials, or used them in the library? _____Yes _____No.

12. Do you ever ask the library staff to help you?
    _____ Often _____ Usually _____Sometimes _____ Never

13. Do you receive the help you request?
    _____ Always _____ Usually _____ Sometimes _____Never

14. How would you rate the library service?
    _____ Excellent _____ Very good _____ Satisfactory _____Unsatis.

15. How would you rate the library staff attitude?
    _____ Excellent _____ Very good _____ Satisfactory _____Unsatisfactor

16. Did you receive good training in the use of the library during orienation?
    _____Yes _____No

17. Have you received instruction in the use of the library by a member of the library staff during a class period. _____ Yes _____ No

18. Are the hours of operation convenient for you? _____ Yes _____ No
    If No, what would you suggest?_____.

19. Is the library large enough? _____ yes _____ No

20. Is the library arranged in a convenient manner? _____ Yes _____ No

21. Is the atmosphere of the library good for study? _____ Yes _____ No
    If no, please explain_____

22. Do you think security should be increased to prevent loss of materials?
_____ Yes _____ No

23. Why do you go to the library? Please rank the following in order of importance. Use 8 for the most important, and 1 for the least important. .

a._____ to study without using library material
b._____ to study and use library material
c._____ to use library material
c._____ to check out material
e._____ to make copies
f._____ to study with friends
g._____ to socialize with friends
h._____ to rest

24. Please rank the three most important areas in which you have used library materials. 3 is high; 2 next; and 1 low.

_____ English
_____ Fine Arts
_____ Speech
_____ Political Science
_____ Physical Education
_____ Science
_____ Engineering
_____ Nursing
_____ Mathematics
_____ Developmental studies
_____ Fire or Police Science
_____ Sociology-Psychology
_____ Business - Secretarial Science

25. Check any of the following items you have used:

_____ Card catalog
_____ Readers guide or other periodical index
_____ Magazines on microfilm
_____ Microfiche
_____ Reference books
_____ Items on reserve
_____ Special services on current topics
_____ Vertical file materials
_____ Copying machine

LIST OF PARTICIPATING CLASSES

ARTS 231-61.....Theory and Practice of Painting

BUAD 100-01.....Introduction to Business

BUAD 165-03.....Principles of Business Management

DAPR 147-01.....Computer Programming

ECON 212-61.....Principles of Economics

ENGL 001-01.....Verbal Studies

ENGL 102-03.....Communication Skills

GOVT 186-61.....National-State-Local Government

LMNP 115-61.....Organization-Administration II

MATH 005-01.....Basic Arithmetic

SECR 136-61.....Filing and Record Keeping

SOCI 103-01.....Introductory Sociology

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 07 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION